

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated January 2, 2008. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments. The claims have been amended to more particularly describe the invention. New claims 14 and 15 have been added to round out the potential scope of protection. No new matter has been added, as these amendments are fully supported in the application. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 10 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hermann et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0030360. In order to anticipate, the cited reference must disclose each and every claimed element and feature. Hermann et al. fail to do so.

In particular, the claimed invention recites a note that includes a substrate having a zone of reduced substrate thickness. This zone of reduced substrate thickness forms a transparent window in the substrate. One of skill in the art, having read and understood the instant application, will appreciate that a zone of reduced substrate thickness is a zone in which the thickness of the substrate has been reduced. For example, the zone of reduced substrate thickness may be formed, as discussed in the specification, by soaking a portion of the substrate, followed by the application of heat and pressure to evaporate liquid and thus densify the paper within the zone relative to the rest of the paper. The zone of reduced substrate thickness is not a hole or window through the substrate.

Hermann et al. disclose a window or hole opening (4) that is encircled with a depression (8) configured to accommodate an additional element disposed over the window or hole (4) and the depressed area (8). However, the depression (8) does not form a transparent window. Therefore, Hermann et al. cannot be considered as disclosing that a zone of reduced substrate thickness forms a transparent window. This is a claimed feature that is expressly absent from the cited reference. With respect to newly added claims 14 and 15, Hermann et al. cannot be considered as disclosing a zone of reduced substrate thickness that is distinct from a through opening.

Moreover, as Hermann et al. cannot be considered as disclosing the claimed zone of reduced substrate thickness, the reference cannot be considered as disclosing the claimed

reinforcing means that increase the resistance of the zone of reduced substrate thickness. For at least these reasons, Hermann et al. cannot be considered as anticipating the claimed invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Keller et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0104364. In order to anticipate, the cited reference must disclose each and every claimed element and feature. Keller et al. fail to do so.

As discussed above, the claimed invention recites a note that includes a substrate having a zone of reduced substrate thickness that forms a transparent window in the substrate. A zone of reduced substrate thickness is not a hole or opening through the substrate.

Keller et al. disclose an opening (2) that is encircled with a depression (5) configured to accommodate an additional element disposed over the opening (2) and the depression (5). However, the depression does not form a transparent window. This is a claimed feature that is expressly absent from the cited reference. With respect to newly added claims 14 and 15, Keller et al. cannot be considered as disclosing a zone of reduced substrate thickness that is distinct from a through opening.

Moreover, as Keller et al. do not disclose the claimed zone of reduced substrate thickness, the reference cannot be considered as disclosing the claimed reinforcing means that increase the resistance of the zone of reduced substrate thickness. For at least these reasons, Keller et al. cannot be considered as anticipating the claimed invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0104364, in view of Admitted Prior Art. Claim 1, from which claim 9 depends, is distinguished above as being patentable over Keller et al. Admitted Prior Art is not believed to remedy the noted shortcomings of Keller et al., and thus claim 1 is patentable over both. Claim 9 includes the elements of claim 1 and thus is patentable for at least the same reasons. Moreover, claim 9 adds further distinguishing features. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/526,257
Amdt. dated March 31, 2008
Reply to Office Action of January 2, 2008

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance in due course is requested. If a telephone conference might be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at (612) 677-9050.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Moreau

By his Attorney,

Date: 3/31/08



David M. Crompton, Reg. No. 36,772
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800
Minneapolis, MN 55403-2420
Telephone: (612) 677-9050
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349